UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 18-430 RS
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
SAMUEL TAYLOR DERENC	OCT 3 0 2018
Defendant.	OLERK, U.S. JIC SOONG NORTHERN DISTRICT SOT COURT
under the Speedy Trial Act from <u>(</u> ends of justice served by the contin	on the record on, 2018, the Court excludes time wind, 2018 to, 2018 and finds that the uance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on
Failure to grant a continuant See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(be would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. B)(i).
defendants, the nature or law, that it is unreasonable	complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of e of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	the would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, cise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuant counsel's other scheduled can See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(the would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given use commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. B)(iv).
	the would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time function, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. B)(iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 10/30/2018	JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defer	2 Pag